

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 11 (renumbered from the second claim 10 originally presented), 12 (originally numbered 11), 14 (originally numbered 13), 16 (originally numbered 15) and 17-24 are in the application. Claims 1, 11 (originally the second claim 10), 12 (originally claim 11), 14 (originally claim 13) and 16 (originally claim 15) have been amended. Claims 2-4, 7-10, 13 (originally numbered 12) and 15 (originally numbered 14) have been cancelled. Claims 17-24 have been added. Claims 1, 12 and 14 (as currently numbered) are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The numbering of the claims has been corrected so that there are no longer two claims numbered "10".

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14 and 16 are rejected as being disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 6,317,728 ("Kane").

To overcome this rejection, claims 1, 12 and 14 have been amended to recite additional features disclosed in the present application and not disclosed in the Kane reference. For example, claim 1, as now amended, is directed to an "apparatus for a computerized trading system", where the apparatus includes "a logic engine comprising an algorithm for implementing a trading strategy" and "an interface comprising a first sub-interface and a second sub-interface". Claim 1 further specifies that, "said first sub-interface allows a user to modify said algorithm by changing a mapping between an event and an action", "said second sub-interface allows the user to review details of orders executed by the logic engine" and "said interface allows the user to navigate among said first and second sub-interfaces".

Support for the first and second sub-interfaces is found at page 16, lines 18-26. Support for the first sub-interface allowing the user to modify the algorithm by changing a mapping between an event and an action is found at page 19, lines 17-26 of the specification. Support for the second sub-interface allowing the user to review details of orders executed by the logic engine is found at FIG. 13 and page 18, lines 20-24 of the specification. Support for the

interface allowing the user to navigate among the first and second sub-interfaces is found at page 16, lines 27-30.

Applicants note that the Kane reference does not disclose a user interface for a trading system in which one sub-interface allows modification of a trading algorithm by changing a mapping between an event and an action and another sub-interface allows review of details of executed orders. Applicants further note that Kane does not in any way disclose a mapping between an event and an action or a user changing such a mapping. Thus Kane fails to provide the advantage of the present invention that users are allowed to modify trading strategy software without the time-consuming and expensive process of involving computer programmers to modify the trading system software. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the Kane reference.

The other independent claims, now numbered 12 and 14, also recite an interface having the two sub-interfaces discussed above. Accordingly, claims 12 and 14 are also submitted as patentable over the Kane reference. Moreover, the other pending claims, all being dependent claims, are submitted as patentable on the same basis as their parent independent claims.

Still further, at least some of the dependent claims recite additional limitations which also are not believed to be disclosed by the Kane reference.

For example, claim 11 (formerly the second claim 10) has been amended to recite that "said interface further comprises a third sub-interface which allows the user to monitor operation of a server computer that executes the logic engine" and "said interface allows the user to navigate among said first, second and third sub-interfaces". Support for the third sub-interface allowing the user to monitor the server computer is found at page 20, lines 22-24 of the specification. Support for the interface allowing navigation among the three sub-interfaces is found at page 16, lines 27-30 of the specification.

Applicants note that the Kane reference does not disclose a third sub-interface as specified in claim 11. Thus claim 11 is believed to be patentable on grounds that are independent of the patentability of its parent claim 1. New claims 19 and 22 are to similar effect and are also believed to be independently patentable.

Further, new claim 17 specifies that the trading strategy is selected from a group of strategies listed in claim 17. Support for these trading strategies is found at page 5, lines 20-26 and page 7, lines 19-30 of the specification. It is noted that none of these strategies is disclosed


in the Kane reference. Accordingly, claim 17 is believed to be patentable on grounds that are independent of the patentability of claim 1. New claims 20 and 23 are similar to claim 17 and also are believed to be independently patentable.

Still further, new claim 18 specifies that "the first sub-interface includes an event editor interface, a condition editor interface and an action editor interface". Support for these editor interfaces is found at page 16, lines 21-27. It is noted that none of these editor interfaces is disclosed in the Kane reference. Consequently, claim 18 also is believed to be patentable on grounds that are independent of the patentability of claim 1. New claims 21 and 24 are similar to claim 18 and are also believed to be independently patentable.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel Levin  
Registration No. 34,860  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Five Elm Street  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-3460

December 29, 2004  
Date